

LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC

Attorneys at Law

65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ
07068-1791



Tel 973.597.2500
Fax 973.597.2400
www.lowenstein.com

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

FROM: Glen E. Books

Date August 24, 2003

TEL: 973.597.6162

FAX: 973.597.6163

E-MAIL: gbooks@lowenstein.com

TO: EXAMINER M. LEWIS

FACSIMILE NO.: 703-872-9318

VOICE NO.: 703-305-3743

To:

FACSIMILE NO.:

VOICE NO.:

To:

FACSIMILE NO.:

VOICE NO.:

To:

FACSIMILE NO.:

VOICE NO.:

To:

FACSIMILE NO.:

VOICE NO.:

TOTAL PAGES (WITH COVER) 6

CLIENT ID/MATTER #: 13518/375

If you have any trouble with this transmittal, please call 973.597.2500 ext. 2849

Message: PLEASE DELIVER DIRECTLY TO EXAMINER M. LEWIS

IN RE: U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/021,174

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 25 2003

GROUP 2800

This facsimile contains Privileged and Confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original facsimile to the above address. We will reimburse you for all expenses incurred. Thank You.

13518/375
08/24/2003 1435912.01

08/25/03 11:23: Jelfax #264: Page 1/6

973 597 2400

Sent BY: LOWENSTEIN SANDLER #4

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. 703-872-9318 on August 25, 2003.

Glen E. Books

Glen E. Books
Reg. No. 24,950
Attorney for Applicants

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of
Angst et al.

Serial No.: 10/021,174

Filing Date: October 29, 2001

For: KINETICALLY CONTROLLED SOLDER
BONDING

Attorney Docket No. ANGST 1-1-11-21-26
(13518-153)

Examiner: M. LEWIS

Art Unit: 2822

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

SIR:

In response to Office Action mailed April 23, 2003, please enter the following remarks into the file of the above-captioned application. A one-month Petition for Extension of Time is included herewith.

I. REMARKS

Claims 17-25 are currently pending in this application and stand rejected. No claim amendments are requested.

13518/153
08/22/2003 1435769.01

II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 17, 20-22, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Published Japanese Patent Application 08-181392, to Kimura Yuji *et al.* ("Kimura"). Claims 18, 19, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kimura in combination with U.S. Patent 5,990,560 (issued Nov. 23, 1999) to D.G. Coult *et al.* ("Coult").

A. APPLICANTS' INVENTION

Applicant discloses and claims an advantageous solder system comprising layers of metallic elements. Due to its carefully designed composition, the solder system of the invention begins melting at a first temperature (T1), then after a certain period of heating, the mixing of the elemental layers yields a composition that melts at a second, higher temperature (T2). The claimed solder system is extremely advantageous because it reduces or eliminates solder remelt during subsequent processing of the bonded part. This essential aspect of the solder system of the invention is reflected by the functional language in claim 17.

"wherein the solder formed by the chemical element layers has a usage temperature which is substantially higher than the first temperature of the binary solder"

The melting temperature of metal alloys is extremely sensitive to the alloy's composition. The point is that Applicants teach a very specific composition defined according to the functional claim language set forth above. Often, compositions are defined in terms of component percentages, however, functional language is a perfectly acceptable means to define a particular composition. See e.g., Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, § 2173.05(g) (8th ed 2001) (citing *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210 (C.C.P.A. 1971)).

B. REJECTIONS OVER KIMURA

Claims 17, 20-22, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kimura. Kimura, however, does teach or suggest Applicants' claimed solder. Kimura's solder composition is totally different. In complete contrast to Applicants' solder, Kimura's solder begins melting at a first temperature (T1), then after a certain period of heating, the mixing of the elemental layers yields a composition that melts at a second, lower temperature (T2). See e.g., Kimura English Language Translation (hereinafter, Kimura-Eng), Abstract ("[t]hereby bonding is enabled at a low melting point . . ."); Kimura-Eng, ¶ 0045 ("[f]rom this state diagram a (Au80wt%-Sn20wt%) nickel alloy becomes lower than the melting of an Au80wt%-Sn20wt% pellet . . .");

Kimura-Eng, ¶ 0045 ("[f]rom these results, the melting point of solder falls, a bonding strength is still stronger . . . "). Nowhere does Kimura teach or suggest Applicants' composition, which begins melting a lower T1 and, thereafter, solidifies at a higher temperature T2. In fact, as discussed above, Kimura teaches the exact opposite, that is, that it is advantageous that the resulting solder composition melt at a lower T2.

Accordingly, the prior art cited by the Examiner teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention. Prior art must be considered in its entirety, including disclosure that teaches away from the claims. See MPEP 2141.02.

A reference may be said to teach away when a person of ordinary skill, upon reading the reference, would be discouraged from following the path set out in the reference, or would be led in a direction divergent from the path that was taken by Applicant.

In re Gurley, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d 1130 (Fed. Cir.1994).

In sum, Kimura does not render any of Applicants' claims obvious because it does teach or suggest a composition wherein the solder formed by the chemical element layers has a usage temperature which is substantially higher than the first temperature of the binary solder. In fact, as discussed above, Kimura teaches the opposite. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness rejection over Kimura.

C. REJECTIONS OVER KIMURA IN VIEW OF COULT

Claims 18, 19, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kimura in combination with Coult. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), Coult is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)/103, thus, the rejection should be withdrawn. Applicants filed on October 25, 2001 and, therefore, are entitled to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) effective for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999. 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) provides that subject matter developed by another person that qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is not available as prior art under § 103 where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Both Coult and the present application were under assignment obligation to the same party at the time the present invention was made. That is, the current application, U.S. Application No. 10/021,174, and U.S. Patent No. 5,990,560 (the "'560 Patent") were, at the time the invention of current Application No. 10/021,174 was made, owned by and/or subject to an

assignment obligation to Lucent Technologies, Inc ("Lucent"). The '560 Patent lists Lucent as the assignee. In an assignment recorded at Reel/Frame 9802/0803, the inventors of the current application (employees of Lucent) assigned all their rights in the invention to Lucent Technologies, Inc. Therefore, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), Coult is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(c)/103 to the present application. The Examiner is respectfully referred to MPEP 706.02(I)(2)(II), Eighth Edition (Revised Feb. 2003). In sum, the obviousness rejection over the combination of Kimura and Coult should be withdrawn because Coult is not prior art for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants have overcome all objections and rejections, and reconsideration is requested. A one-month Petition for Extension of Time is included herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Glen E. Books
Glen E. Books
Reg. No. 24,950
Attorney for Applicants

August 15, 2003

LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068
Tel.: 973-597-6162

OFFICIAL

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 25 2003

GROUP 2800

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a)
(Large Entity)

Docket No.
ANGST 1-1-11-21-26

In Re Application Of: **ANGST et al.**

Serial No.
10/021,174

Filing Date
10/29/2001

Examiner
M. LEWIS

Group Art Unit
2822

Invention: **KINETICALLY CONTROLLED SOLDER BONDING**
TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

This is a request under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the period for filing a response to the Office Action of 04/23/2003 above-identified application.
Date

The requested extension is as follows (check time period desired):

☒ One month ☐ Two months ☐ Three months ☐ Four months ☐ Five months

from: JULY 23, 2003
Date

until: AUGUST 23, 2003
Date

The fee for the extension of time is **\$110** and is to be paid as follows:

- ☐ A check in the amount of the fee is enclosed.
- ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **501358**
- ☒ If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefor and charge any additional fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. **501358**

GLEN E. BOOKS
REG. NO. 24, 950
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE
ROSELAND, NJ 07068
973.597.6162

09/15/2003 TLW11 00000016 501358 10021174

01 FC:1231 110.00 DA

cc:

Dated: 08/25/2003

OFFICIAL
FAX RECEIVED
AUG 25 2003

GROUP 2800

I certify that this document and fee is being deposited
on 08/25/2003 with the U.S. Postal Service as
first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450.

Via facsimile 872-9318

Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Alayne Geller
ALAYNE GELLER

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

P12LARG/REV00